UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,537	12/07/2000	Philip R. Graham	CSCO-86861	1789

7590 10/09/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2171	4

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/733,537	GRAHAM, PHILIP R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon Hoffman	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2000 is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- On page 3, line 18, "a solution can" should be –a solution that can–.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532).

Regarding claim 1, Gupta et al. teaches a digital signature method for a network infrastructure copy protection system (figure 1), comprising the steps of

- Applying a digital signature to a digital content file (column 3, line 41-48);
- Transmitting the content file across a distributed computer network (column 3, lines 49 and 50);

- Examining the content file to determine whether the content file includes the digital signature, the examining performed within the distributed computer network (column 3, lines 50-54);
- Transmitting the content file when the content file includes the digital signature (column 4, lines 7-11); and
- Blocking transmission of the content file when the content file does not include the digital signature (column 4, lines 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 2, Gupta et al. teaches the digital signature is configured to identify the sender of the digital content file (column 3, lines 44-46).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Gupta et al. teaches the examining is performed by a plurality of routers within the distributed computer network (figure 1, reference number 104).

Regarding claim 7, Gupta et al. teaches a restricted data format method for a network infrastructure copy protection system (figure 7), comprising the steps of

- Receiving a digital content file for transmission across a distributed computer network (figure 7, reference number 702);
- Examining the content file to determine whether the content file includes a restricted data format, the examining performed within the distributed computer network (figure 7, reference numbers 704 and 706);

- Transmitting the content file when the content file does not include the restricted data format (figure 7, reference number 708); and
- Blocking transmission of the content file when the content file does include the restricted data format (figure 7, reference number 710).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 4, 6, 8-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532) in view of Gibbs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,321).

Regarding claim 3, Gupta et al. teaches all of the subject matter of claim 1, as discussed above. However, Gupta et al. does not disclose the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network when the content file is transmitted across the distributed computer network.

Gibbs et al. teaches the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network when the content file is transmitted

across the distributed computer network (see figure 4, reference number 432 and column 6, lines 17-26 of Gibbs et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network when the content file is transmitted across the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., to the digital signature method of Gupta et al. It would have been obvious to combine the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network when the content file is transmitted across the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., to the digital signature method of Gupta et al. because the step of logging the digital signature applied to the content file within the distributed computer network when the content file is transmitted across the distributed computer network would keep track of the status information and other information about the creation and authentication of digital signatures (see column 3, lines 63-66 of Gibbs et al.).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Gupta et al. teaches all of the subject matter of claims 1 and 7, respectively, as discussed above. However, Gupta et al. does not disclose the distributed computer network is the Internet.

Gibbs et al. teaches the distributed computer network is the Internet (see figure 4, reference number 444 of Gibbs et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the Internet as the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., with the methods of Gupta et al. It would have been obvious to use the Internet as the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., with the methods of Gupta et al. because using the Internet as the distributed computer network would allow the secure network of Gupta et al. to expand its security to a larger group of people and computers.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Gupta et al. teaches all of the subject matter of claims 1 and 7, respectively, as discussed above. However, Gupta et al. does not disclose the examining is performed by a plurality of cache engines within the distributed computer network.

Gibbs et al. teaches the examining is performed by a plurality of cache engines within the distributed computer network (see figure 4, reference number 420 and column 7, lines 13-28 of Gibbs et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a plurality of cache engines to perform the examining within the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., with the methods of Gupta et al. It would have been obvious to use a plurality of cache engines to perform the examining within the distributed computer network, as taught by Gibbs et al., with the

methods of Gupta et al. because the use of a plurality of cache engines to perform examining within the distributed computer network would allow faster examining of data as it is passed over the distributed computer network (see column 7, lines 15-25 of Gibbs et al.).

Regarding claims 8-10, Gupta et al. teaches all of the subject matter of claim 7, as discussed above. However, Gupta et al. does not disclose the restricted data format includes MP3 data formats, MPEG video data formats, or Word Document formats.

Gibbs et al. teaches:

- The restricted data format includes MP3 data formats (see column 6, lines 59-61 of Gibbs et al.).
- The restricted data format includes MPEG video data formats (see column 6, lines 59-61 of Gibbs et al.).
- The restricted data format includes Word Document formats (see column 6, lines 59-61 of Gibbs et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to include MP3 data, MPEG video data, and Word Document formats as restricted data, as taught by Gibbs et al., with the methods of Gupta et al. It would have been obvious to include MP3 data, MPEG video data, and Word Document formats as restricted data, as taught by Gibbs et al., with the methods of Gupta et al.

because MP3 data, MPEG video data, and Word Document formats as restricted data are the most widely distributed/copied content. By having these three formats as restricted formats, the distributed computer network can prevent the transmission of such data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 703-305-4662. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Brandon Hoffman

BH
10/2/03

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100